

City of San Jose

Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Task Force Meeting #13

151 West Mission Street, Room 202 a and b

Summary of Task Force Meeting #12 and
Community Workshop at the
Southside Community Center on
March 13, 2004

Task Force Members Present:

Mayor Ron Gonzales (co-chair), Councilmember Forrest Williams (co-chair), Vice Mayor Pat Dando, Dan Hancock, Doreen Morgan, Eric Carruthers, Gladwyn D'Sousa, Jim Cunneen, Ken Saso, Neil Struthers, Russ Danielson, Steve Speno, and Terry Watt.

Task Force Members Absent:

Supervisor Don Gage, Craig Edgerton, Christopher Platten, Chuck Butters, Helen Chapman, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins, and Steve Schott Jr.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present:

Kyle Simpson (Greenbelt Alliance), Bobbie Fishler (League of Women Voters), Teresa Alvarado (PG&E), Bob Hall (Almaden Oaks), Tracy Chew (Bay Area Housing Group), Bill Smith (Santa Clara Valley Water District), Robert Benich (Morgan Hill Planning Commission), Salle Hayden (CalCap), Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Scott Plambaeck (City of Morgan Hill), and Joe Mueller (Morgan Hill Planning Commission).

City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present:

Anthony Drummond (District 2), Emily Moody (District 2), Keith Stamps (District 2), Denelle Fedor (District 10), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Salifu Yakubu (PBCE), Boyd, Darryl (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), Jodie Clark (PBCE), Juan Borrelli (PBCE), Dionne Early (PBCE), Tom Duncanson (District 9), Rebecca Flores (Housing), Dave Mitchell (PRNS), and

Vivian-Felix Hart (Housing)

Members of the Public:

There were about 160 people in attendance including 130 people who signed in.

Consultants:

Jodi Starbird (David J. Powers & Associates), Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Mark Day (Dahlin Group), Jack Hsu (Dahlin Group), Mercedes Trujillo (Dahlin Group), Patrick Michel (Dahlin Group), Jim Thatch (Dahlin Group), Ken Kay (KenKay Associates), and Anu Natarajan (KenKay Associates), Paul Barber (KenKay Associates), Jim Musbach, (EPS), Susan State (EPS sub-consultant), Daren Smith (EPS), Eileen Goodwin (APEX), and Chuck Anderson (Schaaf and Wheeler).

1. Sign-in

People signed in and were given a packet of materials and maps, and a red dot to put on one of three maps to identify where they live (a map of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan study area, the Santa Clara County and the broader Bay Area region). If they owned property in the Coyote Valley Specific Plan area they were also given a blue dot to identify the location of their property on the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) study area map. The results of the dot mapping showed that the majority of people were from the Santa Clara County with a few coming from places as far as Alameda and San Leandro. There were 18 people who lived in the CVSP study area and 42 people who owned property in the CVSP study area.

2. Welcome

The meeting convened at 9:35 a.m. with Mayor Ron Gonzales welcoming everyone in attendance to the 13th meeting of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan Task Force, and thanking them for coming on a Saturday. He explained the format for the workshop and stated that there would be a 2- hour bus tour of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan area, followed by a short lunch break at 11:15 a.m., and then a group visioning discussion on seven topics that are relevant to the CVSP Plan area.

3. Coyote Valley Tour

The tour started at 9:00 a.m. from the Southside Community Center, with three buses, each

carrying approximately 50, people. Each attendee was provided a packet of tour information including a tour route map and a corresponding tour narrative with photos, and a map depicting the major physical features of Coyote Valley. The tour lasted two hours with three stops and four pause/pull over points. Each stop lasted 15 minutes, and involved exiting, a group discussion focused on surrounding features, and re-boarding. The tour route entered the study area from Santa Teresa Boulevard, and exited via Monterey Road back to the Southside Community Center at 11:15 a.m. The tour packet information was also posted on the Coyote Valley Specific Plan website.

4. Break (lunch provided)

A 15-minute break was provided upon return from the tour at 11:15 to allow attendees a breather prior to the afternoon session. Lunch and refreshments were provided and attendees helped themselves as the afternoon's event got underway.

5. Introductions

Co-Chair Forrest Williams introduced the Task Force members, Technical Advisory Committee members, property owners, developers, representatives of non-profit organizations, and City of San Jose staff by asking each group to stand.

Councilmember Williams introduced Eileen Goodwin of Apex Strategies, an outreach and facilitation consultant for the Coyote Valley Specific Plan. He explained that Eileen would facilitate the group visioning discussion for the workshop and staff would take notes for the meeting.

6. Impressions and Observations from the Tour

Eileen Goodwin introduced Rosemary Kamei, a board member of the Santa Clara Valley Water District and Vice Mayor Pat Dando. She explained her role as the facilitator and asked the workshop participants to express their impressions and observations about Coyote Valley and the tour. She also explained that no questions would be answered during the workshop, but that the scribes would be recording the issues for future discussion. She however, advised people not to hold back any issues, questions or "disconnects" that they would like addressed at future meetings.

The following are the observations, questions and comments that were made by the participants:

- ?? This is a beautiful valley, but what will it look when it is fully developed in 20 years?
- ?? The rich history of the Ohlone Indians in the Valley should provide the inspiration and

- legitimacy for a historic theme as central organizing principle for the Plan.
- ?? Are the hills scheduled for development? Hopefully they will not be developed.
 - ?? The middle and the northern Coyote Valley areas are greener than the Greenbelt. What efforts would be made to make the Greenbelt greener and protect it?
 - ?? There is a very high water table in this area, and the creeks and riparian corridors should be preserved and protected.
 - ?? It is essential to plan for high density, good public transportation, mixed land uses and a light rail loop for Coyote Valley.
 - ?? The Coyote Valley, with its palms and the green, open spaces are beautiful and make for beautiful living, and should be preserved.
 - ?? Better resident representation and better notification for future Task Force meetings and community workshops is essential for a successful outcome of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan process.
 - ?? Access to the hills, the jogging trails, and the horse trails should be preserved
 - ?? How did the City determine the boundaries of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan area?
 - ?? Open space in the Valley should be preserved
 - ?? How will the base land values be determined, and how would the costs and benefits of urbanization be equitably distributed to the Valley's property owners?
 - ?? How would landowners be compensated if their properties were needed for streets, infrastructure or the open space in the Specific Plan?
 - ?? Will the Specific Plan need to stick to the existing circulation patterns?
 - ?? How would the Specific Plan affect the existing homes in the plan area?
 - ?? There is some possible illegal grading on the Coyote Creek Golf Course. How can this be prevented in the future?
 - ?? How will the Greenbelt area be preserved and enhanced given the degree of parcelization and existing development?
 - ?? The Specific Plan will result in negative impacts on air quality, and potentially create air pollution problems
 - ?? The Specific Plan should include a color theme of earthen colors for buildings instead of whites. Native plants should be encouraged rather than invasive species.
 - ?? The Specific Plan should provide for adequate sewer and potable water capacity for the plan area.
 - ?? What is the fate of farmers in the Greenbelt if farming is precluded as an allowed use?

Co-Chair Forrest Williams thanked the public for all their observations, questions and comments. He and explained the City Council's Direction and Expected Outcomes for the Coyote Valley Specific Plan Task Force, approved in August 2002 as the guiding principles for developing Specific Plan. He emphasized that these guidelines require the use of smart growth planning principles, the planning of North and the Mid-Coyote Valleys together, and the creation of a plan that can be financed and implemented by the private development community. Councilmember Williams also mentioned the permanent preservation of the Greenbelt area, the direction not to move the line between the South and the Mid Coyote Valley, and the requirement of the overall

character of the North and the Mid Coyote areas as a very urban pedestrian transit-oriented community. Other outcomes include planning for both light and heavy rail extensions into the Valley and the maximization of land usage, the inclusion of a minimum of 25,000 housing units (with 20% affordable units) and 50,000 jobs including mixed use concepts, as well as community facilities, libraries, parks and trails, schools and other public facilities. Finally, the Specific Plan must include a balanced phasing of jobs and housing.

7. Planning and Urban Design Considerations

Doug Dahlin was introduced as the lead land planning/urban design consultant. On behalf of his whole team Doug thanked the City for the great opportunity to work on this project. He emphasized the City Council's Direction and Expected Outcomes as previously explained by Councilmember Williams as the starting point for land planning. Doug indicated that the land planning/urban design team had reviewed all of the background information/existing conditions prepared by the Group I technical consultants over the last six to eight months. Using a PowerPoint presentation he summarized the findings of the Group I technical consultants. He explained the natural habitats within the area, noting the absence of special status species. He added that the only special status species are mostly located in the surrounding foothills outside the study area. Since soils and liquefaction are typical of the rest of San Jose, the study doesn't recommend any unusual planning considerations to deal with them.

Starting with water and flooding considerations, Doug explained the defining urban design considerations of the specific plan area. He indicated that Fisher and Coyote Creeks in their existing condition flood in the wet season perform a flood retention/detention function for the valley, which has to be replicated in the Specific Plan. The CVSP also has to maintain the existing surface and ground water quality as well.

Another defining urban design consideration for the plan is the cultural resources in the study area including the heritage oak trees, the history of the Ohlone Indians, and the historic buildings in the Hamlet of Coyote.

Mr. Dahlin also indicated that traffic is also a defining feature. It will have a considerable impact on areas in and around the Coyote Valley. He stated that the Plan would need to rely heavily on a multi-modal circulation system.

He stated that the existing property ownership pattern is another defining urban design consideration. He introduced Jim Musbach, a sub-consultant with Economic planning Systems (EPS), who briefly explained that the EPS would be preparing an integrated economic analysis that would include a market analysis, a financial analysis, a fiscal analysis, a public financing plan and a Greenbelt Implementation plan. He also stated that one of the unique features of this Plan is the large number of property owners.

Mr. Musbach indicated that EPS would prepare a Cost Burden and Feasibility Analysis, which will cost out the infrastructure and public facilities based on demand and benefit. He explained that the higher intensity uses will be allocated a greater share of the costs and that the cost burdens by land use will be tested for financial feasibility. He noted that EPS would develop a plan for how to compensate property owners with lands that will be required for public facilities such as streets, parks, and schools and that the compensation must be commensurate with the development potential of their land.

He indicated that there are a few different approaches on how to accomplish the compensation plan. One member of the public asked whether it would be assumed that the property owners in the Greenbelt area would be handled the same way. Mr. Musbach responded that the strategy was really intended for the properties in the North and the Mid Coyote area and that there would however be a full range of approaches to consider, some of them involving the Greenbelt.

Public Comments on Planning and Urban Design Considerations:

Eileen Goodwin asked for input from the community on the technical issues that had been presented. The community provided the following comments:

- ?? Is this Plan being coordinated with the Brownfield, Greenfield and infill program of the City since this will be our last chance to get it right?
- ?? How will this self-contained Plan for a town work into the City's plan to strengthen the Downtown San Jose (the City has put so much effort into the Downtown)?
- ?? How will property owners who may have indirect impacts from this Plan (for example a 3-story building shading their property) be compensated?
- ?? What will the traffic impacts be to the City of Morgan Hill and how will job tenure be considered in the Plan (people are staying in their jobs fewer years now than they used to)?
- ?? Will eminent domain be used for the Plan and what choice do the property owners have?
- ?? How will the Plan provide and fund schools (there's an early indication that this Plan might double the existing size of the school district)?
- ?? Is the east side of the freeway included in the Plan?
- ?? Are there any plans for health care and hospitals?
- ?? Can we tap into the Salinas water supply for this Plan?
- ?? Is the Specific Plan area in the City or in the County?
- ?? The Coyote Valley is most beautiful today, but it should be noted that a lot of the agricultural uses are being defensively farmed (and losing money) and that agricultural is not profitable any more.
- ?? Can the triggers be changed?

8. Community Vision/Group Discussion

Introductions: Doug Dahlin explained the concept of the “Big Vision” and the purpose of the group visioning process. He then introduced Ken Kay, with KenKay Associates, and stated that Ken’s emphasis is on the environmental foot-printing/planning for the Coyote Valley Specific Plan. Ken explained that they are looking for a new model for a new town - one that will work with the urban form and the natural landscape to achieve public benefit and ensure a good quality of life for residents. He indicated that we would need to change the paradigm that we are used to in town planning.

Ken introduced Jim Musbach, with EPS, who explained the land economics and its relationship to urban form. He explained that the CVSP is a rare opportunity to do something spectacular and unique and to “push the envelope”. He stated that we will need to define what Coyote Valley will be in the context of the greater region, and EPS will be trying to determine what the economic drivers will be in the future of Coyote Valley and in San Jose. He stated that they want to create a model for urban development nationwide and a self-implementing plan that can be realized over the long term.

Group Visioning Session: Mr. Dahlin explained that the group visioning session would involve the collection of input from seven major urban planning topics that will be considered in the development of the Specific Plan. He and Ken will be showing a series of slides regarding each of the seven major topics as food for thought and to illustrate how other developments around the world have responded to urban planning and design challenges. After the slides on each topic Eileen would ask the community for their comments regarding each topic area.

a) Urban Ecology:

Ken Kay defined “urban ecology” as the way in which people and the environment interact together. He indicated that it is important to look at regional level at the beginning in order not to burden future generations. He showed a series of slides illustrating urban ecology and stated that it is important to look at the balance at the community level to be sure that the Plan will result in a good quality of life. Ken reiterated that water is a very important issue in Coyote Valley and indicated that the Santa Clara Valley Water District is in the forefront and a leader in surface and ground water quality management.

He explained that we would develop an environmental footprint and work with the land and the environment from the very beginning of the Plan development. He stated that it will be important to protect Coyote Creek and restore Fisher Creek and that water retention will be a big factor. He explained that there would be opportunities to be creative and combine recreation and open space uses with water retention uses. He also indicated that there might be opportunities to integrate agriculture into the urban environment, which may include agricultural technology and also the green infrastructure (which includes streets, open spaces, parks, hills, creeks and the cultural landscape).

Eileen asked the community to imagine that they are standing on the edge of some water

in Coyote Valley 20 years from now. She asked them what would the water look like and whether the water edge is soft or hard? Are there people in the water? What are they doing? Is there a way to cross the water or do you need to go around it? What else do you want to have the future water be? What about environmental restoration, and sustainability? Should there be "green buildings"? Tree canopies everywhere (formal or clumped)? How could Coyote Valley's agricultural heritage be celebrated in the future? Community gardens? Orchards or vineyards as part of other land uses or as landscape or edges? Should we preserve agriculture in a historic quaint sense or encourage a tie-in to viable modern businesses? Is this a place for experimental crops?

Community Input:

- ?? Encourage recycling and gray water usage, dual plumbing for future use of recycled water, and a central recycling plant.
- ?? Create lake(s) in Coyote.
- ?? A river, like the one in San Antonio with a sense of nostalgia, is needed.
- ?? A navigable river may be out of context in the Coyote valley?
- ?? Riparian habitat should be preserved with no access.
- ?? Keep natural water in a natural state (but if protect standing water against mosquitoes).
- ?? Fishing should be provided for and kids should be able to learn how to fish.
- ?? Use of a lot of fountains in the urban core to reflect the natural water movement.
- ?? Include interpretive centers to explain history of the environment and the creeks and their habitats.
- ?? Green Planning for a wholly sustainable Plan: Include a lot of plants to keep the heat down and use of trees to keep the buildings cool.
- ?? In addition, buildings should have required solar cells on roofs and recycling, and energy conservation features including windows that open for cooling
- ?? Subsidized use of green roofs—with rules that 80% of the landscape should be native.
- ?? Solar street lighting.
- ?? Maintain open land in the valley floor.
- ?? Create mini parks where the heritage trees are.
- ?? Heritage center to explain the agricultural past in the Valley (with demonstrations and educational tools).
- ?? Use pathways to connect residential areas (similar to Valencia by Magic Mountain).
- ?? Need trees everywhere because they are so important.
- ?? Environmental restoration of Fisher and Coyote Creek.
- ?? Encourage new functional technologies in water uses that can also function as aesthetic water features.
- ?? Embrace the agricultural heritage by having community gardens, roof top gardens with creative urban agriculture uses and "urban farming."
- ?? Need to have sustainable agricultural uses and integrate them adequately so they are economically viable for agricultural tourism.

- ?? Provide public farmer's market.
- ?? Attract a new center for high technology agriculture - an incubator for high tech agricultural concepts.
- ?? Broad range of agriculture - from community gardens to mushroom and flower growing with economic incentives to sustain agriculture.
- ?? Agricultural property owners stated that they can't pay the taxes with agricultural uses and that we should not call it "agriculture" (but should call it "urban farming").
- ?? Recommend outreach to "boutique urban farmers" to see how they are doing it in other areas.
- ?? The best land for urban farming is where the buildings are (so we should put the buildings where the land isn't good for farming).
- ?? Incorporate fruit trees into the landscape around corporate settings and for residential and commercial developments.
- ?? Plan for water storage cisterns to keep and re-use water for planting and to conserve water.

b) Transportation Systems and Infrastructure:

Doug presented slides and asked the community to think 20 years forward. He indicated that there might be possibilities for a Caltrain Station, the extension of light rail out into Coyote Valley, multi-modal circulation systems (for bike, walking, jogging), people movers, personal rapid transit and creative delivery of services and goods to people in the community, creative new wireless communication systems and different parking systems.

Eileen again asked people to think about what it would be like 20 years from now in Coyote valley and in the whole region. How do you get here? How are you moving around within the Coyote Valley area? What will mobility be like? Do you have to get around more or less? Do you move around differently for work and play? What about loaner bikes and cars? Shuttles? Deliveries? Telecommuting?

Community Input:

- ?? Include solar powered cars, walk able community, design the whole town for pedestrian use.
- ?? Plan for streetcars like they have in Zurich Switzerland with the honor system.
- ?? Put parking underground since the majority of people will still use cars.
- ?? We use cars because it is convenient and we want choices.
- ?? Get economically viable and efficient transit circulation modes with a lot of choices.
- ?? Need to plan for commuters because not everyone will live and work in Coyote Valley.
- ?? Small mini buses to get people to and from major stops.
- ?? Rental system for multi-modes.
- ?? Telecommuting emphasis and transit-oriented development.

- ?? Need bicycle friendly safe circulation.
- ?? Provide smaller cabs.
- ?? Fiber optics for high speed Internet for each home.
- ?? VTA should go underground (too slow now).
- ?? Need parking, transportation and air quality assessment districts.
- ?? Build a no car zone.
- ?? No one-way rounds.
- ?? Transportation friendly grid system.
- ?? Increase bicycle use (like in Santa Barbara).
- ?? Use mass transit, but people are very independent and they want to be realistic and have control over where they go at all times (exclude cars in the downtown core plaza area).
- ?? Too many empty parking lots (reduce parking requirements).
- ?? Need incentives or disincentives for people to get out of their cars.

c) Urban Form:

Doug showed slides to illustrate different types of organization for the urban form including: the grid system approach which is a very American system, use of architectural style to create the public and private realm, the enclave concept with protected quiet areas, homes with garages on alleys, homes oriented to parks, use of parks, plazas, monuments and use of greenbelt pathways and canal systems.

Eileen asked the community what great kinds of urban form would be in the Coyote Valley of the future? Are their landmarks? If you wanted to send a post card to someone from Coyote Valley what would be on the front of it (one image or many images)? What will define this Place? Is there a pattern?

Community Input:

- ?? Rural-urban pods of housing with circular donut-shaped design on hilltops. Some homes would be facing out to the rural areas with an inner circle and some would face into the rural park-like setting.
- ?? There should be a hierarchy of green spaces with smaller ones connecting to larger ones and then to the rivers.
- ?? Public buildings with parks next to them with active and passive recreation (like Salt Lake City).
- ?? Dual use parks with schools for active recreation uses.
- ?? For increased public safety there should be observable spaces in neighborhoods with neighborhood watch programs.
- ?? Public art, sculptures, murals or fountains in public areas.
- ?? Provide a sense of community like Willow Glen.

- ?? Make smaller communities like enclaves within the bigger community.
- ?? Churches in neighborhoods should be integrated and with shared parking lots with other uses.
- ?? Preserve history and quaintness and save all historic signs and buildings.
- ?? Use all of the good examples in San Jose such as the paseos, narrow streets in Willow Glen, and high-density residential areas as they have done in the Burbank area (we like the vibrancy).
- ?? Use the undulating grid to slow traffic.
- ?? How urban do we want to be? Use the concept of transit-oriented villages.
- ?? Use relevant themes in the town like cows are used in Chicago repeatedly (e.g. an orchard image theme repeatedly in the Coyote Valley).
- ?? Urban form should incorporate the sunrise in the east and the sunset in the west.
- ?? Acknowledge the Ohlone Indians in the town design.
- ?? Utilize commercial and industrial parking lots for other uses on the weekends (shared uses).

d) Public Spaces and Public Buildings:

Doug showed slides to illustrate examples of public spaces and buildings including slides of community centers, high schools, stadiums, community and Olympic-sized pools, parks, play areas, cultural areas, town halls, senior facilities and hospitals.

Eileen explained that this is giant puzzle. Imagine all of these pieces that need to come together: schools, buildings for recreation, seniors, worship, celebration, and government. How do they all fit together? Can some of these places share parking? Are their other efficiencies? What are they? Is recreation in the center or on the edges? Are churches near home, work or school? Why? How will we access open spaces?

Community Input:

- ?? Need a new Coyote Valley school district to cover south San Jose.
- ?? Need to consider theme areas for entertainment and public places (like Hyde Park and the Ferry Building in San Francisco).
- ?? Need to have multi-use buildings (e.g. schools, community centers, libraries).
- ?? Have City parks and schools share the same sites and facilities.
- ?? Buildings should be placed in special spots as focal points throughout the community.
- ?? Public buildings should have public art and steps to have lunches on and lawns/parks.
- ?? Neighbors should be able to vote and plan the uses in their community.
- ?? Public buildings such as police department buildings should be outside of the town center.
- ?? New fairgrounds to hold the County Fair each year.
- ?? Connect Coyote to the existing City and the Downtown and make it work together (do

- not make it separate).
- ?? Outdoor amphitheatre.
- ?? Has this been done successfully someplace else? Can we learn from their good ideas?
- ?? Need to set a Mission Statement as to what we want first.
- ?? Community swimming pool (50 meters).
- ?? Public education—synergy with Stanford University.
- ?? Need a major park in Coyote Valley like Central Park or Golden Gate Park.
- ?? Need a hospital and other medical offices.
- ?? Coyote Valley is so isolated that it will need to stand on its own.
- ?? The Coyote Creek is 17 miles. We need a motor home area and we could use the Creek side areas for other uses, not just bikes.
- ?? Clarify the school district boundaries because we will need a lot more schools.

e) Workplace:

Doug explained that we will need to support 50,000 new primary jobs (not service jobs) and stated that they need to be jobs that bring wealth into our community. He stated that we are all aware of the current high vacancy rates, so this will be a challenge. He stated that corporations will go where they are able to find the best and the brightest people and the best place for their workers to live. He emphasized that we need to create a good place for businesses to come to and he showed some slides of examples of the workplaces around the country that are designed for the “new generation work place” looking out 20 years from now.

Eileen asked everyone to think back for a change to 20-25 years ago and how we were all working in those days. What were our offices like, our tools like, our hours? What products were we working on? What was that workplace like compared to today’s workplace? Can we imagine that much change to our future workplace? How will the workplace of the future look? How can we design a workplace of the future that will be desirable for new business?

What kinds of spaces should we design? What kinds of products will we be designing? Workplaces with lofts, live/work? Concentrated or dispersed? How will people make a living? Will almost everyone work as independent contractors? What will health, education and welfare employment be like? Is there a place for light manufacturing? Will we still be telecommuting?

Community Input:

- ?? More telecommuting and very good high-speed communication (there is no need for big massive office buildings with cubicles).
- ?? Do we really need 50,000 jobs? Can’t we delay and why do we have to do this at all?

- ?? This really doesn't fit in Coyote Valley's city of the future.
- ?? Put affordable housing on top of the workplace and spread it up, not out.
- ?? Telecommuting is good to encourage, but what if the electricity goes off?
- ?? We will need to accommodate well-designed workspaces.
- ?? There is no single solution and we will need diversity of jobs and solutions to the workplace design.
- ?? We will need blue collar jobs too so we should keep everything on the table.
- ?? In the global economy the expansive campus facilities are obsolete and we will have to plan for the creative workplace and provide stimulation and celebration of the major capital that we will be selling from Silicon Valley - entrepreneurial skills, educational and intellectual capital.
- ?? Office uses can accommodate high densities.
- ?? Look at other communities that have successful workplace designs in their communities (e.g. Stanford and University of California) with mixed uses on their campuses where industry shares college campus research and allows for incubators to begin new businesses and provide sharing with the workforce.
- ?? The new jobs will need to create wealth outside the community (50,000 jobs may be naïve).
- ?? If we are talking about jobs and housing we will need to improve education because they are the workforce of tomorrow.
- ?? We will need places of creativity where people can mingle and share ideas - public places that would serve to stimulate the intellectual ideas (informal gathering places to stimulate ideas and get the universities involved).
- ?? Need to re-open the hospital and have a community hospital.
- ?? How do the triggers really work? (There is some skepticism as to whether they will really work).
- ?? We should have a lot of flexibility in the design of the workplace so it will be able to change as the workplace changes (workplace concepts come and go and the workforce tenure changes quickly as well).
- ?? How will the phasing of jobs and housing work?

f) Neighborhoods:

Mr. Dahlin explained that providing the required 25,000 dwelling units will be a challenge and it will be important to spread the densities to provide a diversity of high, middle and lower density throughout the Valley. He showed slides of all of the different housing densities and images of the corresponding building types including: single family detached at a minimum of 10 DU/AC, 2-3 story units at 12-14 DU/AC, attached townhouses at 16-22 DU/AC, clustered attached units at 25 DU/AC, mid to high rise attached housing units with structured parking that could range from 40-50 DU/AC, townhouses over retail which could range from a density of 50-75 DU/AC up to 100 DU/AC. He explained the difference between the thicker and thinner building forms, and stated that at least 20 % of

the units would have to be affordable to meet the City Council guidelines.

Eileen asked some questions about how neighborhoods should be designed. Which of these residential images would you prefer in Coyote Valley? What densities feel right for this place - high-rise, low-rise, mid-rise or a mixture of all of them? What about housing over commercial uses, assisted living, luxury housing, senior housing, housing for imported workers, affordable housing, housing for pre- and post-nesters? How should all of these types of housing be designed and where?

Community Input:

- ?? Would like a mixed range of housing affordability and a mixture of densities with good architecture to make them acceptable.
- ?? Mixed uses over commercial and office uses.
- ?? Senior housing similar to how they do it in Japan where they have a model that allows people to move from varying degrees of assisted living, as necessary, within the same project.
- ?? Do not want low-income ghettos.
- ?? Prefer taller and thinner buildings to allow for more green space (the shorter fatter buildings cause sprawl and reduce the open space).
- ?? Need controls in design and color.
- ?? Need to consider whether 25,000 homes is enough since the 50,000 jobs do not even include the commercial retail jobs.
- ?? Need clarification of point number 7 in the Council guidelines (does it exclude all retail jobs? it says "*primarily* industrial/office jobs").
- ?? Should make sure that the affordable housing has access to the best features in the community.
- ?? What about the economic question as to whether San Jose is gaining or losing on this deal?
- ?? Need clarification as to what the low and middle-income levels are.
- ?? Need to keep this area family-friendly and keep the height to 8-10 stories.
- ?? Allow for good use of balconies and windows for homes and porches facing the streets.
- ?? Don't people want to get away from work? (Why do they want live/work?).
- ?? Could put housing in a campus setting.
- ?? Need to include children's play areas and activities.
- ?? What is the average density on the sites and how do we want the apartment complexes to look?
- ?? There is no problem with the higher densities, but why not put them in downtown San Jose instead of Coyote Valley?
- ?? Houses should have solar systems.
- ?? Want a lot of affordable housing.
- ?? What about the NIMBY concept ("not in my backyard") and how will we integrate

- affordable housing into the community?
- ?? We should integrate all housing with retail and commercial services and include uses like the old corner grocery stores so people don't have to drive everywhere.
- ?? Use dead-end streets for children's safety.
- ?? Keep New York City in New York City.
- ?? Need to preserve the views of the mountains and not have too many high-rise buildings.
- ?? With high density there will be a lot of bright lighting so you can't see the stars at night.
- ?? Should not build the high density until you build the single-family homes.

g) Gathering Places:

Doug Dahlin stated that they want to make an attractive and exciting place for people to come. This preferred model requires creative "out-of-the-box" thinking. He showed slides of neighborhood commercial centers and mixed uses with housing above retail and many attractive public gathering places.

Eileen asked participants to think of other places that they have been that offer good models for the design of public gathering places in Coyote Valley. She asked what are their favorite gathering places in San Jose and around the world? Why are they great places to go?

Community Input:

- ?? Include exclusive pedestrian usage in certain areas of the Plan.
- ?? Use San Jose State Student Union as a model of how to plan different levels with little and big places.
- ?? Outdoor amphitheatre on the side of the hills for concerts.
- ?? Ecology centers along the creeks and in the urban areas of the town (like Switzerland).
- ?? Campus atmosphere like De Anza College.
- ?? Big plazas where mariachi bands could play, and for nightlife and clubs.
- ?? Town of Healdsburg is a good example.
- ?? Incorporate garden concepts that are used in Japan where every garden has a short view and a long view.
- ?? Christmas in the Park should stay in the downtown area.
- ?? Skateboard Parks.

9. Close/Next Steps

Councilmember Forrest Williams thanked everyone for their good comments and ideas and

Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of San Jose City Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, stated that the CVSP Task Force and consultants are required to have a preferred alternative for the Coyote Valley Specific Plan by August 2004, after which it will be presented to the City Council and the environmental impact report for the Plan will be initiated. Laurel pointed out that there is a Task Force meeting schedule in their packets and encouraged the community to attend as many meetings as possible to participate in the development of the preferred alternative.

Laurel indicated that staff would be conducting a Visual Preference Survey after the meeting and invited each member of the public to "vote" their photo preferences from the Power Point slide show that was presented earlier. The participants were given three sets of color dots and directed to proceed to the Oak and Pine Rooms next door and place their red and blue dots on preferred photos and the yellow dots (with Xs) on their least preferred photos.

10. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at about 3:15 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 12, 2004.

Summary of the Visual Preference Survey:

Each participant was provided with five red, blue, and yellow dots each. The red and blue dots were to be spent on the most preferred photos, with the yellow dots on the least preferred ones. Groups of photos were displayed around the Workshop Studio – a room next to the main discussion hall - according to the following seven vision topics discussed earlier.

a) Urban Form:

Photos of:

- ?? Natural Water, Water Aquifer Recharge, Water/Recreation Amenities, Working with the Land, Water Retention and Detention - several dots on each of the 5 photo sheets in favor and none opposed.
- ?? Agriculture/Urban Integration) -15 dots in favor, 2 dots opposed
- ?? Agriculture and Community Gardens, Agriculture/Subscription Vegetables, Agriculture Technology - 29 dots in favor, 0 opposed
- ?? Green Infrastructure - 13 dots in favor, none opposed

b) Transportation:

Photos of:

- ?? Bicycle and Trails - 13 dots in favor.
- ?? People Movers - 7 in favor, 1 opposed.
- ?? Elevated Transit - 1 in favor, and 5 opposed.
- ?? Multi-Modal transportation.

c) Urban Form:

Photos of:

- ?? Monument Styles - 2 in favor, 7 opposed.
- ?? Greenbelt Styles - 10 in favor, 1 opposed.
- ?? Canals Styles - 4 in favor, 5 opposed.

d) Workplaces:

Photos of:

- ?? Next Generation Workplace - 6 in favor, 0 opposed.
- ?? High Tech Campus Industrial (3 and 4 story light industrial buildings) - 5 in favor, and 3 opposed.
- ?? Service Industrial and Light Manufacturing (high-rise) - 5 in favor, 0 opposed.
- ?? Urban Office (high-rise) - 3 in favor, 16 opposed.
- ?? Neighborhood Services (2-story) - 15 in favor, 0 opposed.
- ?? Health Education and Welfare Employment (photos of systems biology and competitive education) - 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

e) Neighborhoods:

Photos of:

- ?? Affordable Housing - 15 in favor, 2 opposed.
- ?? Empty Nesters, Lofts and Rooftops - 3 in favor, 4 opposed.
- ?? Luxury Housing - 6 in favor, 3 opposed.
- ?? Senior Housing - 8 in favor, 0 opposed.
- ?? Residential Neighborhoods (2-story) 10 DU/AC or less - 12 in favor, 3 opposed.
- ?? Family Neighborhood (2-story) 12-14 DU/AC - 14 in favor, 2 opposed.
- ?? Family Neighborhoods (2-story) 16-22 DU/AC - 9 in favor, 2 opposed.
- ?? Family Neighborhoods (3-4 story) 25+ DU/AC - 3 in favor, 2 opposed.
- ?? High-rise Family Neighborhoods (5-story+) 50-75 DU/AC - 7 in favor, 8 opposed.
- ?? High-rise Family Neighborhoods (multi-story)-100 DUAC Housing - 18 in favor 24 opposed.

f) Public Spaces and Places:

Photos of:

- ?? Recreational Places - 3 yes, 0 no.
- ?? Educational Places - 1 yes, 0 no.
- ?? Cultural Places - 4 in favor, 0 opposed.
- ?? Religious Places - 3 in favor, 0 opposed.
- ?? Seniors Centers - 3 in favor, 0 opposed.
- ?? Governmental/Institutional Places - no dots.
- ?? Downtown San Jose (museum and plazas) - 3 in favor, 0 opposed.

g) Gathering Places:

Photos of:

- ?? Neighborhood Commercial Style - 4 in favor, 3 opposed.
- ?? Small Town (Evergreen style) – 8 in favor, 0 opposed.
- ?? Town Center (Santana Row examples shown) - 4 in favor, 0 opposed.
- ?? 4-Story Compact Neighborhood Design (with homogenous architecture) - 0 in favor, 5 opposed.
- ?? Quaint downtown (San Diego's Gas Lamp District examples shown) - 18 in favor, 0 opposed.
- ?? Downtown, with entertainment/stadium (sea world style example) - 0 in favor, 17 opposed.
- ?? Downtown, with examples from San Jose - no dots.

Attachments:

Letter from the League of Women Voters, dated March 2004.

E-mail from Stan Gould with additional Comments regarding the Workshop, dated 3/13/04)